



Anheuser-  
Busch's

Faust Beer

Deliciously flavored by richest of Barley-malt and selected hops perfectly brewed and aged—a delightful refreshment. Delivered to your home at \$1.75 per case of two dozen bottles. At all clubs, hotels, cafes and bars, 10c per bottle.

Brewed at the  
ANHEUSER-BUSCH BREWERY  
ST. LOUIS

Anheuser-Busch Branch  
Distributors  
WASHINGTON, D. C.



## THE CIVIL WAR DAY BY DAY

CONTINUED FROM PAGE FOUR.

to open a small safe containing silver, while from tables and drawers they gathered up the bank's greenbacks, on which Mr. Bishop had been at work. While they were thus engaged a depositor, Samuel Brock, entered the bank to pay a note. His valuables were at once demanded. He replied that they were private property, whereupon he was relieved of his wallet containing \$300 and put into a room with the other two men. The sum of \$300 was also taken from a clerk of Joseph S. Weeks, who went to the bank to deposit the money while the raid was in progress. After administering what they called an oath of fidelity to the Confederacy to the three and warning them not to give an alarm the raiders left the building with \$75,000 of the bank's money. In their hurry they overlooked a large part of the funds.

At the Franklin County Bank another group of raiders found Marcus W. Beardsley, the cashier, talking to Jackson Clark, a wood sawyer, who stood outside the counter. After securing \$75,000 they shut Messrs. Beardsley and Clark into the vault and departed. The

two men were found and released half an hour later.

**Firing in the Streets.**  
While these scenes were going forward there was excitement in the streets. Among the first persons detained was Capt. George P. Conger, a soldier recently returned from the front. He had seen such things before and, waiting a chance, evaded his guard and dodged into a side street, called on every man he met to secure arms and join him in attacking the raiders.

At this time some of the Confederates were engaged in guarding their prisoners, others in throwing bottles of incendiary chemicals against and into buildings, and others were taking horses from stables and out of the shafts of carriages along the sidewalk, so that they might ride away to Canada.

Conger was not gone long. He reappeared with a rifle in his hands. Several other citizens also hurried forward, armed.

Lieut. Young was counseling his men to "keep cool" when Conger aimed at him with a rifle at short range and snapped the trigger. The cap did not explode. Twice more the trigger was pulled without effect.

By this time firing had begun on both sides. One shot from the raiders struck Elmus J. Morrison, of Manchester, N. H., a building contractor, inflicting a wound in the abdomen that caused death three days later. Not much sorrow was felt

for Mr. Morrison in St. Albans as he was a sympathizer with the South. Collins H. Huntington, of St. Albans, a business man, was wounded seriously, and Lorenzo Bingham, slightly. (Huntington's life was despaired of, but after several weeks he recovered.)

With a paring fusillade the raiders rode out of the town northward, having been engaged in the raid less than half an hour. Their attempts at burning the place had failed, as their chemicals, fifty bottles of kerosene and oil, were destroyed. Two or three fires started, but were quickly subdued. The booty from the banks, and the two citizens, however, \$20,125, they carried off, though not so safely as not to drop bills and coins along the road.

**Taken in Canada.**  
Pursuit was organized by Capt. Conger. At Shelton, Vt., the town next north of St. Albans, the pursuers came up with the raiders in time to prevent them from looting the Mississippi Bank in that place, as the Southerners originally had intended. Two bridges that the raiders had set on fire were saved.

The raiders, on leaving St. Albans, divided their band, some entering Canada via Enosburg Falls and others via Burlington. The St. Albans party of Burkholder proceeded into Canada and late that night some of the Southerners were found in Freilburg, and others in Cambridge, and still others during the next day or two at near-by points. In all fourteen were apprehended by the Canadian officials. Lieut. Young being among number. They had on their persons money taken from St. Albans to the amount of \$56,000. The rest of the money was in the custody of the escaping members of the band. The \$28,000 was placed in the hands of the Canadian authorities.

When news of the raid reached New York, Gen. John A. Dix, commanding the Department of the East, ordered troops from Boston and from Brattleboro to Northern Vermont. Later he issued an order to the commanders on the border, authorizing them to shoot down raiders wherever found, and to pursue them into Canada if necessary. President Lincoln revoked the order, as to the latter provision, which was plainly improper.

The captured raiders were taken to Montreal for their trial for extradition. When arraigned all declared they were Confederate soldiers, acting under orders of their superior officer, Lieut. Young; that their act was an act of war, and that they had not violated the neutrality of Great Britain.

The raiders gave their names as Benoit H. Young, Samuel Eugene Lackey, Amanda Pope Bruce, Marcus A. Spurr, William H. Hutchinson (real name William H. Huntley), Dudley Moore, Thomas Bronson Collins, Samuel Simpson Greaves, Charles Moore Swager, who later became United States consul at St. Etienne, France, and who was killed in the Franco-Prussian war; George Scott, James Alexander Doty, and Squire Turner Tevis, all of Kentucky; Caleb McDowell Wallace, a native of Kentucky, late of Texas; and Joseph McDuffy, born in Ireland, and late of Texas. Lieut. Young had been a divinity student. After the war he settled as a lawyer in Louisville, where he attained prominence, and where he was living in 1914.

The escaping members included John D. McInnis, of Mississippi, who not long ago was a railroad commissioner in that State; Daniel Mock Butterworth, of Alabama; William T. Tevis, brother of Squire Turner Tevis, who was apprehended; Louis T. Price, Charles H. Hig-

bee, and John E. Moss, all of Kentucky. This brings the total to twenty, but there were at least two and probably three other members of the band whose names have never been revealed by Lieut. Young. One of them is said to be Hezekiah Payne. Higbee was shot through the body, but recovered.

**Raiders Given Liberty.**  
The presiding judge, Charles Joseph Couriel, discharged the prisoners and ordered the money taken from them restored to them. The raiders left the court amid applause and cheers from the crowd. The money was full of people from the South. The Canadian Parliament suspended Judge Couriel from his position on the bench, but he did not suffer in popular esteem and afterward was elected mayor of Montreal. Five of the raiders, Messrs. Young, Spurr, Hutchinson, Swager, and Tevis, were arrested and returned before Judge J. Smith for breach of the neutrality laws, but were discharged on the ground that inasmuch as Lieut. Young held a Confederate commission (it was probably spurious), and his enterprise was authorized by C. C. Clay, Jr., it was a belligerent act.

The five were immediately rearrested, however, and taken to Toronto for trial for breach of the neutrality laws. As the raiders had been too shrewd to declare publicly against it, while those in favor could have easily helped the amendment, the various States by giving their endorsement. Before the Democratic Cabinet is cast into outer darkness, however, let the question before the Senate be to find one Republican Cabinet of which anywhere near half the members declared themselves to be for equal suffrage.

Meanwhile the women in the States where suffrage amendments are pending will doubtless adopt the plan of their English sisters and heckle the eminent speakers until they will have to answer or run. It is reported that Mr. Bryan is already being in advance by saying to the Ohio women that he cannot speak for their amendment because the Democratic platform of that State has not endorsed it. They naturally ask how it was that as the next highest official in the national administration he could come out with such a broadside of endorsement when it was not in the national platform.

At present the Democratic National Committee is on the blacklist along with the Committee on Rules of the Democratic House of Representatives, and the Congressmen Union makes a logical argument in favor of putting the responsibility on the party itself. In outlining its plan of work at the conference held at Marble House, Newport, Miss Paul said:

"We are all agreed that it is the Democratic party which is responsible for the blocking of the national suffrage amendment. Again and again that party has gone on record through the action of its leaders in the party caucus and its committee that an impregnable case has been built up against it. Now that we have 4,000,000 women voters we need no longer make our appeal simply to men."

"The time has come when, we believe, we can really go into national politics and use these votes to win the vote for the rest of us. It would be unintelligent not to use this power to defeat a sufficient number of votes from the party in control of the government to prove that the suffrage question is a

**DULL, SPLITTING  
SICK HEADACHE**

Dr. James' Headache Powders Relieve at Once—10 Cents a Package.

"You take a Dr. James' Headache Powder and in just a few moments your head clears and all neuralgia and pain fades away. It's the quickest and surest relief for headache, whether dull, throbbing, splitting, or nerve-racking. Send some one to the drug store and get a dime package now. Quit suffering—it's so needless. Be sure you get Dr. James' Headache Powders—then there will be no disappointment.—Adv.

## WOMAN SUFFRAGE IN ACTIVE POLITICS

National Democratic Committee's Order to Cabinet Members Helps War on Congressional Union.

By IDA HUSTED HARPER.

From the time that the Congressional Union, headed by Miss Alice Paul and Miss Lucy Burns, announced its intention of going into the States where women vote and of waging a war against the Democratic candidates, the vigorous objection from many suffragists. The official board of the National Association, this repeatedly denounced this action, and its president, Dr. Anna Howard Shaw, has sent personal letters to the State presidents, which have been widely published, protesting especially against efforts to defeat Democratic Senators, who for many years have been of the greatest help to the cause, such men as Senators Thomas and Shafroth, of Colorado.

It must be said, however, that the action of the Democratic National Committee last week in forbidding the members of the Cabinet to mention woman suffrage in their campaign speeches between now and election day has driven thousands of women to endorse the policy of the Congressional Union to wage war on that party. It was a high handed action, which States where the Cabinet members tamely submit to be muzzled on what is now universally recognized as a national question. Suffragists will be justified in holding the entire party responsible.

For instance, is Secretary Bryan, who declared in his recent manifesto favoring woman suffrage: "The voters of Nebraska will at the election in November adopt or reject the equal suffrage amendment. As a citizen of that State I must participate in the decision." "I am not in doubt as to my duty. I am not acting under orders from the Democratic National Committee, he must not during his speaking tour in Nebraska just before the election make any reference to this amendment.

The Cabinet ministers must go into the States where women now can vote and appeal to them to cast their ballots for the Democratic candidates, but they must not say one word to help the women in their fight for the coming election will decide whether they shall have the right to vote.

Of course this order may not be an unmitigated evil, as only half of the Cabinet are known to be in favor of woman suffrage, but it may be safely assumed that even without an official embargo the nonpartisan attitude which the coming election will decide whether they shall have the right to vote.

An analysis of conditions emphasizes more strongly than ever before that the wise thing for the suffragists is to continue the nonpartisan attitude which they always have maintained. It is true that a Democratic committee brought the question before the States, which a Republican committee had refused to do for twenty-seven years, but among the thirty-five favorable votes it received were only thirteen from Democrats and seven of these came from the enfranchised States: of the thirty-four negative votes twenty-two were Democratic.

This result would seem to indicate that two-thirds of the Republicans were in favor and one-third of the Democrats were against it. It is not known that there was not a ghost of a chance of the amendment getting the necessary two-thirds there is no telling how many of them would have voted, except those from the States where women have the suffrage, and they had to vote yes.

A study of the States does not tend to clarify the situation. In New York, for instance, a Democratic legislature voted to submit a woman suffrage amendment after Republican legislatures had refused to do so for fifteen years, but the coming constitutional convention is to be dominated by the Democrats, and word has already gone out from the leaders that it shall not put a woman suffrage clause in the new Constitution. It is wholly impossible to keep track of all the State conventions, but they seem to break nearly even in adopting the woman suffrage plank, with the odds slightly in favor of the Democrats. In Massachusetts and Rhode Island the Democrats declared in favor of submission and the Republicans declined to do so; this was also the case in Nevada, where the question will be voted on next month. Democratic platforms in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York, Connecticut, Illinois and most parts of the country have included woman suffrage planks.

Looking over the entire situation there seems to be no justification whatever for fighting this party except the very bad record made by the present House of Representatives, and even here it is not so bad as the Republican record. It gave ten times more hours to suffrage hearings than any Republican House ever did; its Judiciary Committee reported out the suffrage amendment, which Republican committees had also

live political issue that cannot be ignored. At this same conference Mrs. Harriot Stanton Blatch, after using the remark so often repeated by her distinguished mother that all classes of men seeking enfranchisement had always had classes of enfranchised men to help them, but women had to make the struggle alone, called attention to the fact that at last there was a great body of women voters who could extend a helping hand and said:

"Give up the idea when you are entering upon the political aspect of our question that it makes any difference what a man's personal views are as to suffrage. Whether he is for or against he can give you only one vote, but as a cog in a political wheel he is extremely important. We do not care one bit whether a member of Congress is for woman suffrage or against it; we simply want him to act so as to put the question before the State legislatures."

That a caucus bill is clearly shown is not to be denied; nevertheless, there is substantial basis for the opposition to the union's policy of trying to defeat all Democratic candidates for Congress in the enfranchised States. This action plays directly into the hands of the Republican party, whose record on woman suffrage is so black as to make that recently made by the Democratic party look white.

The former was in control of the national administration almost continuously for fifty years, and except for a few favors during its high water mark in the first half of this period, it never rendered the slightest assistance to the cause of woman suffrage in Congress. It could not fail back on the convenient doctrine of State rights, for again and again the defeat of amendments in various State campaigns could be traced directly to its influence.

During all of these years, however, the Democrats were so openly and frankly opposed that the suffragists never expected anything from them, and now the altered attitude of this party, as far as it goes, is not due to a change of heart but to change in the political situation. Woman suffrage as an abstract principle is one thing, and as an accomplished fact in ten States is another.

An analysis of conditions emphasizes more strongly than ever before that the wise thing for the suffragists is to continue the nonpartisan attitude which they always have maintained. It is true that a Democratic committee brought the question before the States, which a Republican committee had refused to do for twenty-seven years, but among the thirty-five favorable votes it received were only thirteen from Democrats and seven of these came from the enfranchised States: of the thirty-four negative votes twenty-two were Democratic.

This result would seem to indicate that two-thirds of the Republicans were in favor and one-third of the Democrats were against it. It is not known that there was not a ghost of a chance of the amendment getting the necessary two-thirds there is no telling how many of them would have voted, except those from the States where women have the suffrage, and they had to vote yes.

A study of the States does not tend to clarify the situation. In New York, for instance, a Democratic legislature voted to submit a woman suffrage amendment after Republican legislatures had refused to do so for fifteen years, but the coming constitutional convention is to be dominated by the Democrats, and word has already gone out from the leaders that it shall not put a woman suffrage clause in the new Constitution. It is wholly impossible to keep track of all the State conventions, but they seem to break nearly even in adopting the woman suffrage plank, with the odds slightly in favor of the Democrats. In Massachusetts and Rhode Island the Democrats declared in favor of submission and the Republicans declined to do so; this was also the case in Nevada, where the question will be voted on next month. Democratic platforms in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York, Connecticut, Illinois and most parts of the country have included woman suffrage planks.

Looking over the entire situation there seems to be no justification whatever for fighting this party except the very bad record made by the present House of Representatives, and even here it is not so bad as the Republican record. It gave ten times more hours to suffrage hearings than any Republican House ever did; its Judiciary Committee reported out the suffrage amendment, which Republican committees had also

live political issue that cannot be ignored. At this same conference Mrs. Harriot Stanton Blatch, after using the remark so often repeated by her distinguished mother that all classes of men seeking enfranchisement had always had classes of enfranchised men to help them, but women had to make the struggle alone, called attention to the fact that at last there was a great body of women voters who could extend a helping hand and said:

"Give up the idea when you are entering upon the political aspect of our question that it makes any difference what a man's personal views are as to suffrage. Whether he is for or against he can give you only one vote, but as a cog in a political wheel he is extremely important. We do not care one bit whether a member of Congress is for woman suffrage or against it; we simply want him to act so as to put the question before the State legislatures."

That a caucus bill is clearly shown is not to be denied; nevertheless, there is substantial basis for the opposition to the union's policy of trying to defeat all Democratic candidates for Congress in the enfranchised States. This action plays directly into the hands of the Republican party, whose record on woman suffrage is so black as to make that recently made by the Democratic party look white.

The former was in control of the national administration almost continuously for fifty years, and except for a few favors during its high water mark in the first half of this period, it never rendered the slightest assistance to the cause of woman suffrage in Congress. It could not fail back on the convenient doctrine of State rights, for again and again the defeat of amendments in various State campaigns could be traced directly to its influence.

During all of these years, however, the Democrats were so openly and frankly opposed that the suffragists never expected anything from them, and now the altered attitude of this party, as far as it goes, is not due to a change of heart but to change in the political situation. Woman suffrage as an abstract principle is one thing, and as an accomplished fact in ten States is another.

An analysis of conditions emphasizes more strongly than ever before that the wise thing for the suffragists is to continue the nonpartisan attitude which they always have maintained. It is true that a Democratic committee brought the question before the States, which a Republican committee had refused to do for twenty-seven years, but among the thirty-five favorable votes it received were only thirteen from Democrats and seven of these came from the enfranchised States: of the thirty-four negative votes twenty-two were Democratic.

This result would seem to indicate that two-thirds of the Republicans were in favor and one-third of the Democrats were against it. It is not known that there was not a ghost of a chance of the amendment getting the necessary two-thirds there is no telling how many of them would have voted, except those from the States where women have the suffrage, and they had to vote yes.

A study of the States does not tend to clarify the situation. In New York, for instance, a Democratic legislature voted to submit a woman suffrage amendment after Republican legislatures had refused to do so for fifteen years, but the coming constitutional convention is to be dominated by the Democrats, and word has already gone out from the leaders that it shall not put a woman suffrage clause in the new Constitution. It is wholly impossible to keep track of all the State conventions, but they seem to break nearly even in adopting the woman suffrage plank, with the odds slightly in favor of the Democrats. In Massachusetts and Rhode Island the Democrats declared in favor of submission and the Republicans declined to do so; this was also the case in Nevada, where the question will be voted on next month. Democratic platforms in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York, Connecticut, Illinois and most parts of the country have included woman suffrage planks.

Looking over the entire situation there seems to be no justification whatever for fighting this party except the very bad record made by the present House of Representatives, and even here it is not so bad as the Republican record. It gave ten times more hours to suffrage hearings than any Republican House ever did; its Judiciary Committee reported out the suffrage amendment, which Republican committees had also

live political issue that cannot be ignored. At this same conference Mrs. Harriot Stanton Blatch, after using the remark so often repeated by her distinguished mother that all classes of men seeking enfranchisement had always had classes of enfranchised men to help them, but women had to make the struggle alone, called attention to the fact that at last there was a great body of women voters who could extend a helping hand and said:

"Give up the idea when you are entering upon the political aspect of our question that it makes any difference what a man's personal views are as to suffrage. Whether he is for or against he can give you only one vote, but as a cog in a political wheel he is extremely important. We do not care one bit whether a member of Congress is for woman suffrage or against it; we simply want him to act so as to put the question before the State legislatures."

That a caucus bill is clearly shown is not to be denied; nevertheless, there is substantial basis for the opposition to the union's policy of trying to defeat all Democratic candidates for Congress in the enfranchised States. This action plays directly into the hands of the Republican party, whose record on woman suffrage is so black as to make that recently made by the Democratic party look white.

The former was in control of the national administration almost continuously for fifty years, and except for a few favors during its high water mark in the first half of this period, it never rendered the slightest assistance to the cause of woman suffrage in Congress. It could not fail back on the convenient doctrine of State rights, for again and again the defeat of amendments in various State campaigns could be traced directly to its influence.

During all of these years, however, the Democrats were so openly and frankly opposed that the suffragists never expected anything from them, and now the altered attitude of this party, as far as it goes, is not due to a change of heart but to change in the political situation. Woman suffrage as an abstract principle is one thing, and as an accomplished fact in ten States is another.



ACCORDING to Twentieth Century Standards—the two fundamental essentials in measuring STABILITY are ABILITY and RELIABILITY.

The officers and directors of this institution are practical bankers and business men whose ability and responsibility have been proven in their record—and under their management this bank is a safe depository for your funds.

3 per cent interest on savings accounts compounded semi-annually.

4 per cent interest paid on time certificates of deposit.

Under United States Treasury Supervision.



SECURITY SAVINGS AND COMMERCIAL BANK

NINTH & G STREETS NORTHWEST WASHINGTON, D. C.

cept those from the States where women have the suffrage, and they had to vote yes.

A study of the States does not tend to clarify the situation. In New York, for instance, a Democratic legislature voted to submit a woman suffrage amendment after Republican legislatures had refused to do so for fifteen years, but the coming constitutional convention is to be dominated by the Democrats, and word has already gone out from the leaders that it shall not put a woman suffrage clause in the new Constitution. It is wholly impossible to keep track of all the State conventions, but they seem to break nearly even in adopting the woman suffrage plank, with the odds slightly in favor of the Democrats. In Massachusetts and Rhode Island the Democrats declared in favor of submission and the Republicans declined to do so; this was also the case in Nevada, where the question will be voted on next month. Democratic platforms in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York, Connecticut, Illinois and most parts of the country have included woman suffrage planks.

Looking over the entire situation there seems to be no justification whatever for fighting this party except the very bad record made by the present House of Representatives, and even here it is not so bad as the Republican record. It gave ten times more hours to suffrage hearings than any Republican House ever did; its Judiciary Committee reported out the suffrage amendment, which Republican committees had also

live political issue that cannot be ignored. At this same conference Mrs. Harriot Stanton Blatch, after using the remark so often repeated by her distinguished mother that all classes of men seeking enfranchisement had always had classes of enfranchised men to help them, but women had to make the struggle alone, called attention to the fact that at last there was a great body of women voters who could extend a helping hand and said:

"Give up the idea when you are entering upon the political aspect of our question that it makes any difference what a man's personal views are as to suffrage. Whether he is for or against he can give you only one vote, but as a cog in a political wheel he is extremely important. We do not care one bit whether a member of Congress is for woman suffrage or against it; we simply want him to act so as to put the question before the State legislatures."

That a caucus bill is clearly shown is not to be denied; nevertheless, there is substantial basis for the opposition to the union's policy of trying to defeat all Democratic candidates for Congress in the enfranchised States. This action plays directly into the hands of the Republican party, whose record on woman suffrage is so black as to make that recently made by the Democratic party look white.

The former was in control of the national administration almost continuously for fifty years, and except for a few favors during its high water mark in the first half of this period, it never rendered the slightest assistance to the cause of woman suffrage in Congress. It could not fail back on the convenient doctrine of State rights, for again and again the defeat of amendments in various State campaigns could be traced directly to its influence.

During all of these years, however, the Democrats were so openly and frankly opposed that the suffragists never expected anything from them, and now the altered attitude of this party, as far as it goes, is not due to a change of heart but to change in the political situation. Woman suffrage as an abstract principle is one thing, and as an accomplished fact in ten States is another.

An analysis of conditions emphasizes more strongly than ever before that the wise thing for the suffragists is to continue the nonpartisan attitude which they always have maintained. It is true that a Democratic committee brought the question before the States, which a Republican committee had refused to do for twenty-seven years, but among the thirty-five favorable votes it received were only thirteen from Democrats and seven of these came from the enfranchised States: of the thirty-four negative votes twenty-two were Democratic.

This result would seem to indicate that two-thirds of the Republicans were in favor and one-third of the Democrats were against it. It is not known that there was not a ghost of a chance of the amendment getting the necessary two-thirds there is no telling how many of them would have voted, except those from the States where women have the suffrage, and they had to vote yes.

A study of the States does not tend to clarify the situation. In New York, for instance, a Democratic legislature voted to submit a woman suffrage amendment after Republican legislatures had refused to do so for fifteen years, but the coming constitutional convention is to be dominated by the Democrats, and word has already gone out from the leaders that it shall not put a woman suffrage clause in the new Constitution. It is wholly impossible to keep track of all the State conventions, but they seem to break nearly even in adopting the woman suffrage plank, with the odds slightly in favor of the Democrats. In Massachusetts and Rhode Island the Democrats declared in favor of submission and the Republicans declined to do so; this was also the case in Nevada, where the question will be voted on next month. Democratic platforms in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York, Connecticut, Illinois and most parts of the country have included woman suffrage planks.

Looking over the entire situation there seems to be no justification whatever for fighting this party except the very bad record made by the present House of Representatives, and even here it is not so bad as the Republican record. It gave ten times more hours to suffrage hearings than any Republican House ever did; its Judiciary Committee reported out the suffrage amendment, which Republican committees had also

live political issue that cannot be ignored. At this same conference Mrs. Harriot Stanton Blatch, after using the remark so often repeated by her distinguished mother that all classes of men seeking enfranchisement had always had classes of enfranchised men to help them, but women had to make the struggle alone, called attention to the fact that at last there was a great body of women voters who could extend a helping hand and said:

"Give up the idea when you are entering upon the political aspect of our question that it makes any difference what a man's personal views are as to suffrage. Whether he is for or against he can give you only one vote, but as a cog in a political wheel he is extremely important. We do not care one bit whether a member of Congress is for woman suffrage or against it; we simply want him to act so as to put the question before the State legislatures."

That a caucus bill is clearly shown is not to be denied; nevertheless, there is substantial basis for the opposition to the union's policy of trying to defeat all Democratic candidates for Congress in the enfranchised States. This action plays directly into the hands of the Republican party, whose record on woman suffrage is so black as to make that recently made by the Democratic party look white.

The former was in control of the national administration almost continuously for fifty years, and except for a few favors during its high water mark in the first half of this period, it never rendered the slightest assistance to the cause of woman suffrage in Congress. It could not fail back on the convenient doctrine of State rights, for again and again the defeat of amendments in various State campaigns could be traced directly to its influence.

During all of these years, however, the Democrats were so openly and frankly opposed that the suffragists never expected anything from them, and now the altered attitude of this party, as far as it goes, is not due to a change of heart but to change in the political situation. Woman suffrage as an abstract principle is one thing, and as an accomplished fact in ten States is another.

An analysis of conditions emphasizes more strongly than ever before that the wise thing for the suffragists is to continue the nonpartisan attitude which they always have maintained. It is true that a Democratic committee brought the question before the States, which a Republican committee had refused to do for twenty-seven years, but among the thirty-five favorable votes it received were only thirteen from Democrats and seven of these came from the enfranchised States: of the thirty-four negative votes twenty-two were Democratic.

This result would seem to indicate that two-thirds of the Republicans were in favor and one-third of the Democrats were against it. It is not known that there was not a ghost of a chance of the amendment getting the necessary two-thirds there is no telling how many of them would have voted, except those from the States where women have the suffrage, and they had to vote yes.

A study of the States does not tend to clarify the situation. In New York, for instance, a Democratic legislature voted to submit a woman suffrage amendment after Republican legislatures had refused to do so for fifteen years, but the coming constitutional convention is to be dominated by the Democrats, and word has already gone out from the leaders that it shall not put a woman suffrage clause in the new Constitution. It is wholly impossible to keep track of all the State conventions, but they seem to break nearly even in adopting the woman suffrage plank, with the odds slightly in favor of the Democrats. In Massachusetts and Rhode Island the Democrats declared in favor of submission and the Republicans declined to do so; this was also the case in Nevada, where the question will be voted on next month. Democratic platforms in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York, Connecticut, Illinois and most parts of the country have included woman suffrage planks.

## SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES

**ACCOUNTANCY.**  
Fundamentals of Accountancy, Shorter Courses in Accountancy, Business Administration, Professional C. P. A. Course, Cost Accounting, Law for Business Men offered, 1 to 24 year courses. FREE. WASHINGTON SCHOOL OF ACCOUNTANCY, Y. M. C. A., 1756 G Street N. W.

**THE TEMPLE SCHOOL**  
1417 G ST. N. W.  
STENOGRAPHY, BOOKKEEPING, ENGLISH, CIVIL SERVICE.  
Phone M. 228.

**THE DE GUERIN**  
School of Music  
NOW OPEN.  
1710 I St. N. W.  
Piano, Violin, Voice, etc.  
ALL BRANCHES OF MUSIC.  
Mail waiting 300 for rent of recitals, lectures, and entertainments. Studies for rent for teaching.

**Mount Vernon Seminary**  
Southwest Corner  
M and Eleventh Streets.  
RESIDENT AND DAY SCHOOL  
FOR GIRLS.

Fortieth year opens Wednesday, October 1. Preparatory and Collegiate departments. Certificate credits to leading colleges. Special advantages in Music and Modern Languages. Ample playgrounds with golf course, tennis and basketball courts.  
(Miss) ELIZABETH J. SOMERS,  
(Miss) ADELIA GATES HENSLY,  
Principal.

**GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY LAW SCHOOL**  
Begins its Fifth Year 420 P. M.  
Member of the Association of American Law Schools, which requires strict standards for admission and course. This ensures a select student body and maximum credit from other law schools. Students in the United States law work done in this school. Instruction meeting approved methods by professional teachers trained in the law in law schools and by lawyers in active practice.

Three-year course for LL. B. degree; one-year post-graduate for LL. M. or M. P. L. degrees. Graduate work accepted in law schools.

Personnel course, 2-3, or afternoon, 4-5-6-7. Optional course, 12-1-2 P. M.  
NECHARTARY, Mamie Thomas, Main 626.

**Drillery**  
Business and Civil Service College  
1100 N. Y. Ave.

**STEWART'S BUSINESS COLLEGE**  
12th and F Sts. N. W.  
Washington's Leading Business College.

Largest Gregg Shorthand School in Washington.  
Special Class, 4:45 to 6 P. M.  
Send for New Catalogue.

**MISS VICTORIA SIDDONS**  
ELOCUTION AND DRAMATIC ART.  
THE HILLSIDE, 1445 Chapin. Phone Col. 62.

**WASHINGTON BUSINESS AND CIVIL SERVICE SCHOOL**  
1017 N. Y. Ave. N. W. W. C. POTTER, Principal.

**Y. M. C. A. INSTITUTE.**  
Accountancy, Stenography, Bookkeeping, Preparatory Languages, Mathematics, Physics, LOST GRADES MADE UP. Day and evening. Exam-ple: Drafting, 1 year, \$12.00. 1756 G Street N. W.

**SINGING, ELOCUTION.**  
MRS. EMILY FRENCH BARNES,  
14